

REMARKS

This Amendment is in response to the Office Action dated July 2, 2007, in which claims 9-18 were allowed, claims 1, 2, 6-8 and 21 were rejected, claims 3-5 and 22-32 were objected to, and claims 19 and 20 were withdrawn from consideration. With this Amendment, independent claim 1 has been amended, and claims 19 and 20 are cancelled without prejudice in view of Applicant's right to file a divisional patent application directed to the subject matter of claims 19 and 20.

In the Office Action, claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Bharthulwar U.S. Patent No. 5,847,904. The Office Action states that Bharthulwar defines "a reader width ("track width"-TW) of the magnetoresistive sensor by forming current contacts (e.g., conductors 34, 36) over the magnetoresistive sensor as the reader width (e.g., TW) is not defined until the current contacts are formed over the magnetoresistive sensor and the distance is set between the current contacts (e.g., 34, 36, col. 4, lines 35-55)."

Claim 1 has been amended to clarify that the reader width that is defined subsequent to defining the striped height back edge is a physical reader width. This is in contrast to Bharthulwar, which uses current contacts to define an electrical reader width, but not a physical reader width of the magnetoresistive sensor.

Bharthulwar does not indicate the order of defining the back edge of the magnetoresistive sensor and the two side edges of the magnetoresistive sensor. It is two side edges that define the physical reader width of the magnetoresistive sensor. The Office Action did not rely upon the physical edges of the magnetoresistive sensor as defining track width, but rather the edges of the current contacts 34 and 36 in FIG. 2C. Contacts 34 and 36 are deposited after both the back edge and the two side edges of the MR sensor have been defined.

Thus, there is no teaching in Bharthulwar of defining a stripe height back edge of a magnetoresistive sensor, and subsequently defining a physical read width of the magnetoresistive sensor. With the amendment to claim 1, the rejection of claim 1 as being anticipated by Bharthulwar has been overcome, and should be withdrawn.

Claims 2 and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bharthulwar in view of Fontana et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,609,948. As a result of the amendment to claim 1, Bharthulwar does not disclose the claimed method recited in claim 1. Fontana does not supply the teaching that is missing from Bharthulwar. As a result, claims 2 and 21, which depend from claim 1, are now in condition for allowance.

Claims 6-8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bharthulwar in view of Shouji et al. U.S. Patent No. 5,722,157. As a result of the amendment to independent claim 1, dependent claims 6-8 are now in condition for allowance. Neither Bharthulwar nor Shouji teach or suggest all the elements of independent claim 1 or dependent claims 6-8.

Claims 3-5 and 22-32, which were objected to, are in condition for allowance as a result of the amendment of claim 1.

In conclusion, this Amendment has placed the application in condition for allowance. Notice to that effect is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

KINNEY & LANGE, P.A.

Date: 10/2/07

By: 

David R. Fairbairn, Reg. No. 26,047
THE KINNEY & LANGE BUILDING
312 South Third Street
Minneapolis, MN 55415-1002
Telephone: (612) 339-1863
Fax: (612) 339-6580